



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,523	02/21/2002	Hubert C. Kelley	11658.02	1027

38598 7590 06/02/2005

ANDREWS KURTH L.L.P.
1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

ALAUBAIDI, HAYTHIM J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2161

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/081,523

Applicant(s)

KELLEY, HUBERT C.

Examiner

Haythim J. Alaubaidi

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-10,12-35,37-40 and 45-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 45-50 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-10,12-35,37-40 and 51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Election/Restrictions

1. Newly submitted claim 45-50 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

a- Newly added Claims 45-50 are directed to class 707, Subclass 104.1 which is different from the original presented claims 1-44 which is directed to class 707, Subclass 101;

b- newly added claims 45-50 contains limitations that are significantly different from the original presented claims 1-44; such as for example:

1- in the preamble the limitation "business entity as a supplement or alternative to public courthouse services" was not disclosed in the original claims of 1-44 (combination/subcombination);

2- "uploading party per specifications and terms agreed upon by the uploading party and the business entity";

3- "identifying the uploading party";

4- "time and date stamping";

5- "providing electronic access and searchability"; and

6- "downloading party".

c- the new limitations mentioned above are subcombination that does not require the subcombination of the original claims 1-44; yet they are usable together as a combination/subcombination.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claim 45-50 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

DETAILED ACTION

2. This communication is a 2nd non-final office action in response to the amendment of February 10, 2005.
3. The Examiner acknowledges the cancellation of Claims 1, 11, 36 and 41-44.
4. Claims 45-51 are new added claims filed with the current amendment of February 10, 2005; of which the Examiner withdrew from consideration Claims 45-50 due to a clear restriction; the Examiner is considering from the new Claims only claim No. 51 as it contains the same limitations of the original claims 1-44 but with a new combination.
5. Claims 2-10, 12-35, 37-40 and 51 are presented for examination, of which Claims 2, 15, 18, 20 and 51 are independent claims.
6. In light of the amendment to claim 2, the Examiner is withdrawing the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection to Claim No. 2.
7. Claims 2-10, 12-35, 37-40 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-10, 12-35, 37-40 has been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 2-10 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over William Athing (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,498 and Athing hereinafter) in view of John Maxwell (U.S. Patent No. 6,098,070 and Maxwell hereinafter).

Regarding Claim 2, Athing discloses,
receiving documents, from corresponding representatives without requiring submission of the documents (Figure No. 18 and corresponding text; see also Col 5, Lines 4-6, 13-16 and 23-24)¹;
maintaining a central repository for electronically storing the documents, (Figure No. 1, Element No. 38) including:

¹ The user checking his/her e-mails (documents) from a corresponding representative (the sender or the originator of the email) in figure No. 18 is receiving (viewing) the emails (document) without the submission requirement of another entity, because it was maintained by the server until the user gets to Figure No. 18 and is able to view them.

organizing the documents in a data structure (Figure No. 18 and corresponding text); and

providing one or more uniform templates for presentation of the related documents (Figure No. 16)².

Athing's reference discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above including web-based e-mails, retrieving and composing them; the reference does not explicitly indicate the step of litigation-related documents; associating each of the litigation-related documents with the corresponding adjudication entity in which the litigation-related document was filed; and selectively providing access to the stored litigation-related documents. However Maxwell teaches litigation-related documents (Figure No. 2, Element 230; see also Figure No. 5B, Settlement Type: Litigation); associating each of the litigation-related documents with the corresponding adjudication entity in which the litigation-related document was filed (Figure No 16 and corresponding text); and selectively providing access to the stored litigation-related documents (Col 20, Line 60 through Col 21, Line 12; see also Col 19, Lines 37-38).

Given the intended broad application of the Athing system, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Athing with the teachings of Maxwell to include a litigation-related documents with its filing in a judicial system (such as in Maxwell) and implement

it in a web based environment; in order to reach a larger number of subscribers which would lead to an increase revenue (see Claims 13-14 and 16-17).

Regarding Claim 3, Athing discloses permitting the downloading of the documents in a plurality of formats (Athing, Figure No. 16 and corresponding text; see also Maxwell, Figure No 29, Element No. 2915).

Regarding Claim 4, the limitations of this claim was discloses in the rejection of Claims 2 and 3, above. It is therefor rejected as set forth.

Regarding Claim 5, Maxwell discloses receiving a search query, searching the database and providing the results (Col 6, Lines 49-55; see also Col 18, Line 53 through Col 19, Line 4).

Regarding Claims 6-7, the limitations of this claim was discloses in the rejection of Claim 2, above. It is therefor rejected as set forth.

Regarding Claim 8, Maxwell discloses exhibits (Maxwell, Figure No. 2, Element No. 245; see also Figure No. 15 and associated text; see also Col 5, Lines 16-17).

² Please note that the Examiner is interpreting the configuring of the presentation of the e-mail to personalize it is the same as providing a uniform template for presenting the document.

Regarding Claim 9, the limitations of this claim was discloses in the rejection of Claim 2, above. It is therefor rejected as set forth.

Regarding Claims 10, Athing discloses third parties (Col 5, Lines 4-9)³.

Regarding Claim 12, Maxwell discloses hard copies (Figure No. 1, Element 125 and corresponding text).

Regarding Claims 13-14, Athing discloses charging a fee based upon a time period (Figure No. 11 and corresponding text; see also Col 10, Lines 36-46, especially Lines 44-46).

11. Claim 16, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over William Athing (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,498 and Athing hereinafter) in view of John Maxwell (U.S. Patent No. 6,098,070 and Maxwell hereinafter) and further in view James Crosskey (U.S. Patent No. 6,035,281 and Crosskey hereinafter) and further in view Sheldon Goldberg (U.S. Patent No. 6,712,702 and Goldberg hereinafter).

Regarding Claim 16, the combination of both Athing and Maxwell discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above, except for the limitations of Claim 16,

³ Please note that the "users" will be the first party; the "system" will be the second party; and the "network service providers" or the "e-mail providers" will be the third party.

wherein "paying a fee and not agreeing to receive on-line advertisements, and paying no fee and agreeing to receive the on-line advertisements".

However Crosskey, discloses paying a fee and not agreeing to receive on-line advertisements (Crosskey, Col 11, Lines 26-32, i.e. different pricing...no advertisement).

Given the teachings of the combinations of both Athing and Maxwell, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of both Athing and Maxwell with the teachings of Crosskey by allowing the user to pay a fee in order not to receive any advertisements to compensate the owner of the system for the lost revenue from not running any adds to certain users; especially when the owner of the system depends on the revenue generated from the advertisers who pay the owner of the system for running their advertisements.

The combination of all three references for Athing, Maxwell and Crosskey discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above, except for the limitation of "paying no fee and agreeing to receive the on-line advertisements".

However Goldberg, discloses paying no fee and agreeing to receive the on-line advertisements (Goldberg, Col 28, Lines 33-39).

Given the obviousness for combining Athing, Maxwell and Crosskey, It would also be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Athing, Maxwell and Crosskey with the teachings of Goldberg

Art Unit: 2161

by permitting the user to access the files for free in exchange for allowing the advertisements to be displayed on the user's screen; one good reason would be since the owner of the system who is allowing the access is getting paid by the advertisers then the system's owner can allow the access for free; another good reason would be to attract more users by allowing them to access the files for free (Goldberg, Col 28, Lines 38-39).

12. Claim 17, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over William Athing (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,498 and Athing hereinafter) in view of John Maxwell (U.S. Patent No. 6,098,070 and Maxwell hereinafter) and further in view Baldev Krishan (U.S. Patent No. 6,442,529 and Krishan hereinafter).

Regarding Claim 17, the combination of both Athing and Maxwell discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above, except for the limitation of Claim 17, wherein providing users with on-line advertisement space at no fee or at a reduced fee in exchange for the users agreeing to require others to use the central repository.

However Krishan, discloses providing users with on-line advertisement space at no fee or at a reduced fee in exchange for the users agreeing to require others to use the central repository (Krishan, Col 8, Lines 23-31).

Given the teachings of the combinations of both Athing and Maxwell, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of both Athing and Maxwell with the teachings of

Krishan by not charging for the advertisement space as the owner of the system can be compensated for the loss revenue by allowing and/or referring more users to access the system.

13. Claims 15, 20-21, 23-35 and 39-40, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over William Athing (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,498 and Athing hereinafter) in view of John Maxwell (U.S. Patent No. 6,098,070 and Maxwell hereinafter) and further in view Sheldon Goldberg (U.S. Patent No. 6,712,702 and Goldberg hereinafter).

Regarding Claims 15 and 20, Athing discloses:

receiving documents, from corresponding representatives without requiring submission of the documents (Figure No. 18 and corresponding text; see also Col 5, Lines 4-6, 13-16 and 23-24)⁴;

maintaining a central repository for electronically storing the documents, (Figure No. 1, Element No. 38) including:

organizing the documents in a data structure (Figure No. 18 and corresponding text); and

selectively providing access to the stored document (Figure No. 17 and corresponding text; see also Col 12, Lines 13-16)

⁴ The user checking his/her e-mails (documents) from a corresponding representative (the sender or the originator of the email) in figure No. 18 is receiving (viewing) the emails (document) without the submission requirement of another entity, because it was maintained by the server until the user gets to Figure No. 18 and is able to view them.

Athing's reference discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above including web-based e-mails, retrieving and composing them; the reference does not explicitly indicate the step of litigation-related documents; associating each of the litigation-related documents with the corresponding adjudication entity in which the litigation-related document was filed; and the limitation of permitting a user to access on-line the litigation-related documents in the central repository in exchange for the user's agreement to receive on-line advertisements.

However Maxwell teaches litigation-related documents (Figure No. 2, Element 230; see also Figure No. 5B, Settlement Type: Litigation); associating each of the litigation-related documents with the corresponding adjudication entity in which the litigation-related document was filed (Figure No 16 and corresponding text); and selectively providing access to the stored litigation-related documents (Col 20, Line 60 through Col 21, Line 12; see also Col 19, Lines 37-38).

Given the intended broad application of the Athing system, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Athing with the teachings of Maxwell to include a litigation-related documents with its filing in a judicial system (such as in Maxwell) and implement it in a web based environment; in order to reach a larger number of subscribers which would lead to an increase revenue (see Claims 13-14 and 16-17).

The combination of both Athing and Maxwell discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above, except for the limitation of "permitting a user to access on-line

the litigation-related documents in the central repository in exchange for the user's agreement to receive on-line advertisements".

However Goldberg, teaches permitting a user to access on-line the litigation-related documents in the central repository in exchange for the user's agreement to receive on-line advertisements (Goldberg, Col 28, Lines 33-39).

Given the obviousness for combining both Athing and Maxwell, It would also be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of both Athing and Maxwell with the teachings of Goldberg by permitting the user to access the files in exchange for allowing the advertisements to be displayed on the user's screen; one good reason would be to attract more users (Goldberg, Col 28, Lines 38-39).

Regarding Claim 21, Goldberg discloses web site accessible via a network address (Goldberg, Col 40, Lines 58-65).

Regarding Claim 23, Athing discloses permitting the downloading of the documents in a plurality of formats (Athing, Figure No. 16 and corresponding text; see also Maxwell, Figure No 29, Element No. 2915).

Regarding Claims 24-25, 27-28 and 30, the limitations of these claims were disclosed in the rejection of Claims 15 and 20, above. They are therefor rejected as set forth.

Regarding Claim 26, the limitations of this claim were addressed in rejecting claims 15 and 20 above. In addition, Maxwell discloses receiving a search query, searching and providing the results (Col 6, Lines 49-55; see also Col 18, Line 53 through Col 19, Line 4).

Regarding Claim 29, the limitations of this claim were addressed in rejecting claims 15 and 20 above. In addition, Maxwell discloses exhibits associated with the documents (Maxwell, Figure No. 2, Element No. 245; see also Figure No. 15 and associated text; see also Col 5, Lines 16-17).

Regarding Claim 31, Athing discloses third parties (Col 5, Lines 4-9)⁵.

Regarding Claim 32, Athing discloses providing one or more uniform templates for presentation of the related documents (Figure No. 16)⁶.

Regarding Claim 33, Maxwell discloses hard copies (Figure No. 1, Element 125 and corresponding text).

⁵ Please note that the "users" will be the first party; the "system" will be the second party; and the "network service providers" or the "e-mail providers" will be the third party.

⁶ Please note that the Examiner is interpreting the configuring of the presentation of the e-mail to personalize it is the same as providing a uniform template for presenting the document.

Regarding Claims 34-35, Athing discloses charging fees for on-line access (Figure No. 11 and corresponding text; see also Col 10, Lines 36-46, especially Lines 44-46).

Regarding Claim 39, Goldberg discloses hyperlinking documents (Col 26, Lines 47-53).

Regarding Claim 40, the limitations of this claim was addressed in rejecting claims 29 and 39. it is therefor rejected as set forth above.

14. Claim 22, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over William Athing (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,498 and Athing hereinafter) in view of John Maxwell (U.S. Patent No. 6,098,070 and Maxwell hereinafter) and further in view Sheldon Goldberg (U.S. Patent No. 6,712,702 and Goldberg hereinafter) and further in view of the Examiner's Office Notice.

Regarding Claim 22, the combinations of Athing, Maxwell and Goldberg discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above, except the references does not explicitly indicate a site map, however the Examiner takes Official Notice that site maps for web sites are notoriously well known in the art. Given the intended broad application of the combinations of Athing, Maxwell and Goldberg references, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Athing, Maxwell and Goldberg by adding this

Art Unit: 2161

notoriously well known feature to ease and simplify the locations of a content on a website to the user and in order to allow a faster navigation of the site by the user.

15. Claim 37, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over William Athing (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,498 and Athing hereinafter) in view of John Maxwell (U.S. Patent No. 6,098,070 and Maxwell hereinafter) and further in view Sheldon Goldberg (U.S. Patent No. 6,712,702 and Goldberg hereinafter) and further in view James Crosskey (U.S. Patent No. 6,035,281 and Crosskey hereinafter).

Regarding Claim 37, and due to the dependency of Claim 37 from Claim 20, the combinations of Athing, Maxwell and Goldberg discloses all the claimed limitations of claim 37, including the limitation of "paying no fee and agreeing to receive the on-line advertisements" (Goldberg, Col 28, Lines 33-39).

The combination of all three references for Athing, Maxwell and Goldberg discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above, except for the limitations of "paying a fee and not agreeing to receive on-line advertisements".

However Crosskey, discloses paying a fee and not agreeing to receive on-line advertisements (Crosskey, Col 11, Lines 26-32, i.e. different pricing...no advertisement).

Given the obviousness for combining Athing, Maxwell and Goldberg, It would also be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention

to modify the teachings of Athing, Maxwell and Goldberg with the teachings of Crosskey by allowing the user to pay a fee in order not to receive any advertisements to compensate the owner of the system for the lost revenue from not running any adds to certain users; especially when the owner of the system depends on the revenue generated from the advertisers who pay the owner of the system for running their advertisements.

16. Claim 38, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over William Athing (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,498 and Athing hereinafter) in view of John Maxwell (U.S. Patent No. 6,098,070 and Maxwell hereinafter) and further in view Sheldon Goldberg (U.S. Patent No. 6,712,702 and Goldberg hereinafter) and further in view Baldev Krishan (U.S. Patent No. 6,442,529 and Krishan hereinafter).

Regarding Claim 38, the combination of all three references for Athing, Maxwell and Goldberg disclosed all of the claimed subject matter set forth above, except for the limitation of "providing users with on-line advertisement space at no fee or at a reduced fee in exchange for the users agreeing to require others to use the central repository".

However Krishan, discloses providing users with on-line advertisement space at no fee or at a reduced fee in exchange for the users agreeing to require others to use the central repository (Krishan, Col 8, Lines 23-31).

Given the teachings of the combinations of Athing, Maxwell and Goldberg, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's

Art Unit: 2161

invention to modify the teachings of Athing, Maxwell and Goldberg with the teachings of Krishan by not charging for the advertisement space as the owner of the system can be compensated for the loss revenue by allowing and/or referring more users to access the system.

17. Claim 18-19, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over William Athing (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,498 and Athing hereinafter) in view of John Maxwell (U.S. Patent No. 6,098,070 and Maxwell hereinafter) and further in view Sheldon Goldberg (U.S. Patent No. 6,712,702 and Goldberg hereinafter).

Regarding Claim 18, Athing discloses:

receiving documents, from corresponding representatives without requiring submission of the documents (Figure No. 18 and corresponding text; see also Col 5, Lines 4-6, 13-16 and 23-24)⁷;

maintaining a central repository for electronically storing the documents, (Figure No. 1, Element No. 38) including:

organizing the documents in a data structure (Figure No. 18 and corresponding text); and

selectively providing access to the stored document (Figure No. 17 and corresponding text; see also Col 12, Lines 13-16).

⁷ The user checking his/her e-mails (documents) from a corresponding representative (the sender or the originator of the email) in figure No. 18 is receiving (viewing) the emails (document) without the submission requirement of another entity, because it was maintained by the server until the user gets to Figure No. 18 and is able to view them.

Athing's reference discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above including web-based e-mails, retrieving and composing them; the reference does not explicitly indicate the step of litigation-related documents; associating each of the litigation-related documents with the corresponding adjudication entity in which the litigation-related document was filed; and the limitation of hyperlinking documents.

However Maxwell teaches litigation-related documents (Figure No. 2, Element 230; see also Figure No. 5B, Settlement Type: Litigation); and associating each of the litigation-related documents with the corresponding adjudication entity in which the litigation-related document was filed (Figure No 16 and corresponding text).

Given the intended broad application of the Athing system, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Athing with the teachings of Maxwell to include a litigation-related documents with its filing in a judicial system (such as in Maxwell) and implement it in a web based environment; in order to reach a larger number of subscribers which would lead to an increase revenue (see Claims 13-14 and 16-17).

The combination of both Athing and Maxwell discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above, except for the limitation of hyperlinking documents.

However Goldberg discloses hyperlinking documents (Col 26, Lines 47-53).

Given the obviousness for combining both Athing and Maxwell, It would also be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to

modify the teachings of both Athing and Maxwell with the teachings of Goldberg by including a notoriously well-known feature in the art such as hyperlinking, one good reason would be to minimize the complexity of the system by increasing the system friendliness through the use of short cuts such as hyperlinking and in order to attract more users.

Regarding Claim 19, the limitations of this claim was addressed in rejecting Independent claim No. 18 above. In addition, Maxwell discloses exhibits (Maxwell, Figure No. 2, Element No. 245; see also Figure No. 15 and associated text; see also Col 5, Lines 16-17).

18. Claim 51, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over William Athing (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,498 and Athing hereinafter) in view of John Maxwell (U.S. Patent No. 6,098,070 and Maxwell hereinafter) and further in view Sheldon Goldberg (U.S. Patent No. 6,712,702 and Goldberg hereinafter).

Regarding Claim 51, Athing discloses:

receiving documents, from corresponding representatives without requiring submission of the documents (Figure No. 18 and corresponding text; see also Col 5, Lines 4-6, 13-16 and 23-24)⁸;

⁸ The user checking his/her e-mails (documents) from a corresponding representative (the sender or the originator of the email) in figure No. 18 is receiving (viewing) the emails (document) without the submission requirement of another entity, because it was maintained by the server until the user gets to Figure No. 18 and is able to view them.

maintaining a central repository for electronically storing the documents, (Figure No. 1, Element No. 38) including:

organizing the documents in a data structure (Figure No. 18 and corresponding text);

providing one or more uniform templates for presentation of the related documents (Figure No. 16)⁹; and

selectively providing access to the stored document based on a fee charged for access (Figure No. 11 and corresponding text; see also Col 10, Lines 36-46, especially Lines 44-46; see also Figure No. 17 and corresponding text; see also Col 12, Lines 13-16).

Athing's reference discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above including web-based e-mails, retrieving and composing them; the reference does not explicitly indicate the step of litigation-related documents; associating each of the litigation-related documents with the corresponding adjudication entity in which the litigation-related document was filed; and the limitation of hyperlinking documents.

However Maxwell teaches litigation-related documents (Figure No. 2, Element 230; see also Figure No. 5B, Settlement Type: Litigation); and associating each of the litigation-related documents with the corresponding adjudication entity in which the litigation-related document was filed (Figure No 16 and corresponding text).

⁹ Please note that the Examiner is interpreting the configuring of the presentation of the e-mail to personalize it is the same as providing a uniform template for presenting the document.

Given the intended broad application of the Athing system, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Athing with the teachings of Maxwell to include a litigation-related documents with its filing in a judicial system (such as in Maxwell) and implement it in a web based environment; in order to reach a larger number of subscribers which would lead to an increase revenue (see Claims 13-14 and 16-17).

The combination of both Athing and Maxwell discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above, except for the limitation of hyperlinking documents.

However Goldberg discloses hyperlinking documents (Col 26, Lines 47-53).

Given the obviousness for combining both Athing and Maxwell, It would also be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of both Athing and Maxwell with the teachings of Goldberg by including a notoriously well-known feature in the art such as hyperliking, one good reason would be to minimize the complexity of the system by increasing the system friendliness through the use of short cuts such as hyperlinking and in order to attract more users.

Points of Contact

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haythim J. Alaubaidi whose telephone number is (571) 272-4014. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (571) 272-4023.

Any response to this office action should be mailed to:

The Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 or telefax at our fax number (703) 872-9306.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window of the Randolph Building at 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314

Haythim J. Alaubaidi


FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100
Art Unit 2161
May 26, 2005